REMARKS

Applicant is in receipt of the Office Action mailed May 22, 2006. Claims 2-18 were rejected. Reconsideration of the case is earnestly requested in light of the following remarks. This response is being filed with a Request for Continued Examination. There are no current amendments to the claims.

Claims 2-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blake et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,574,854 (hereinafter "Blake"), in view of Bilger, U.S. Patent No. 6,912,429 (hereinafter "Bilger"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 2 recites as follows:.

2. (Previously Presented) A system for performing a simulation, the system comprising:
    a first program;
    a measurement/control program;
    a simulation program; and
    an input device;
    wherein the system can be configured to turn a simulation mode either on or off;
    wherein the first program is operable to:
        receive a request for input from the measurement/control program;
        determine whether the system is in simulation mode; and
        selectively route the request for input, depending on whether the system is in simulation mode, wherein selectively routing the request for input comprises:
        routing the request for input to the simulation program if the system is in simulation mode;
        routing the request for input to the input device if the system is not in simulation mode.

The Examiner states that Blake teaches the first program, the measurement/control program, and the simulation program. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Blake relates to a method and system for simulating the execution of an application program. A simulation system first records the interaction between the application program and an existing operating system (an old operating system) during an

execution of the application program. The simulation system then takes this recorded interaction and simulates the interaction with a new operating system. (See Col. 4, lines 26-34).

The Examiner cites the same portions of Blake with respect to all three of the programs recited in claim 2 and does not clearly specify which programs in Blake he considers to correspond to the respective programs in claim 2. Thus, it is not at all clear which programs in Blake the Examiner has equated with the three respective programs recited in claim 2. Applicant assumes that the Examiner has taken Blake's simulation system as the simulation program of claim 2 and has taken Blake's application program as the measurement/control program of claim 2. However, it is not at all clear what the Examiner has taken as the "first program" recited in claim 2 because Blake does not teach any program that is operable to selectively route a request for input received from another program to either a simulation program or an input device. Blake simply does not teach selectively routing a request for input in this manner. Likewise, Bilger also does not teach selectively routing a request for input, as recited in claim 2.

Applicant thus submits that the cited references, taken either singly or in combination, do not teach the limitations recited in claim 2, for at least the reasons set forth above. Thus, claim 2 is patentably distinct over the cited art for at least this reason. Independent claims 17 and 18 recite similar subject matter as claim 2, and are thus also believed to be patentably distinct over the cited art.

Since the independent claims are patentably distinct over the cited art, the dependent claims are also patentably distinct, for at least this reason. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions not taught or suggested by Blake and Bilger. However, since the independent claims have been shown to be patentably distinct, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC Deposit Account No. 50-1505/5150-42901/JCH.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

☒ Return Receipt Postcard

☒ Request for Continued Examination

Respectfully submitted,

Jeffrey C. Hood
Reg. No. 35,198
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: August 22, 2006 JCH/JLB